G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1902-03.
(Manager)

File No. 109

Serial Nos. 1-9

Papers Filed.

Month July 1906.

SUBJECT.

File re the Baraward of the Agamek of the Chamarajeswaraswami temple at Chamaraj nagar and exempting Kumaraswamy Deekshet from furnishing Security

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT:— Surrender of the Office of the Archaik in the Chamarajeswaraswami Temple at Chamarajnagar

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 71 dated 18th October 1902

from the Dy Commissioner Mysore District—

The Archaik's appointment in the Sri Chamarajeswaraswami Temple at Chamarajanagar carries with it a salary of Rs 14 per mensem and 6 & 1/2 & 1/2 daily. This is a hereditary appointment

2. One Ramjumdar Deekshit was the Surrendrar of this Office and on his

his death in 1894, the
Paramount was transferred*
to the name of Lakshmana
(his widow) her own
brother, Annathana Nanjunda
Deekshitar, being allowed
as hereditary
to do duty on her behalf.
In the revised Tasdik Patti
of the temple framed by the
late Nanjunda Sastriyar in
1898, it has been noted
that a cadre of 14 Rs being
the pay attached to the office
Rs 7 should be paid to the
Paramountdar and Rs 7
to the person who does duty as Archaka; the 8 Vrittis - 8½ being also given to the latter.

* Vide late Nanjunda Sastri's Rubkari no 309 dated 31st August 1894 to the Nanjunda Asst Commr Nanjunda District (marked A)

3. The said Annathana-
Nanjunda Deekshitar appears
to have died on the 18th
October 1901. Lakshmana
the

B

the Bursar-Adhar, Thirumoor,
addressed a petition to
this Office on the 21st
July 1902, stating that
on the death of her brother
she presented two petitions
to the Archakar of the
Chamarajanagar Taluk
praying that the Bursar
of Agamik in the said
temple, which stood in
her name, be transferred
to the name of Kumara-
-swami Deekshit (with
all the responsibilities
attached thereto) as he
was her own brother-in-
-law and the sole Varas-
-dar and protector &
that the matter had not
been

4

disposal of. The Dy
Commissioner was
thereupon requested to
submit a full report
together with the records
bearing on the subject.
In reply, the Dy Commr
states (in his letter no
71 dated 18th October 1902)
that, on the death of
Aswatha Narayana Deekshit
(the petitioner's brother)
Subbamma (the petitioner)
was called upon to select
a pleader to do the work
but she failed to do so;
that the Amildar with
the approval of the District Magrai
thereupon appointed one
Kumara

note:-
From the records now
received from the
Dy Commissioner,
there appears to be no
issued to her
written orders on this
point.

⁂ Hullakalli Kumara Dackshita

⁂ Kumara Dackshita to act as a Gumasta on Rs 7 which ceased to be paid to the late Gumasta. And finding that a moiety of the pay was going to a stranger, Subbamma petitioned that the Barwand might be made in the name of her brother-in-law Kumaraswami Dackshit; that

⊗ Nanjangud Kumaraswami Dackshita

⊗ as his Kumaraswami Dackshit was already employed as the Archak of the Sivakunteswara swami Temple at Nanjangud on a pay of Rs 20, it was deemed

deemed inadvisable
to make any change in
the Bargaining; that
the petitioner's brother-
in-law Ramaraswami
Deekshith says no doubt
that he will manage
the work in both the temples
but that having regard
to the distance between
Nanjangud and Chamaraj-
-nagar and the liberal
pay attached to the office
at both places, he (Dy
Commr) is not in favour
of one man having the Agamik
in both places, which is
an unsatisfactory arrangement.

4. The Varamanthar records

received

received with the
Commissioner's be
thus as follows: —

5 Asmatha murugesa
Dakshit, brother of the
petitioner Kathiramma,
died on the 18th October
1907.
Kathiramma presented a
petition to the Assistant of
the Chavakachcheri
Court on the 4th December
1907
stating that it took a
long time to complete the
funeral ceremonies of
the deceased, as Brahmins
were not available & that
everything in connection
therewith was completed
about 8 days ago; and
requesting that Chandra-
sekharam Dakshina duty

Archak of the Chennakesava
temporarily
Temple, be allowed to do
duty for a month, within
which period the would
make permanent arrangements
for the Conduct of the work.
No action appears to have
been taken on this petition,
but it contains a note
by the Architect (Mr.
Lakshmanaraja Iyengar)
that the petitioner was
informed to produce a
Competent person to do duty
in the meanwhile
and that one Komara-
Dikshit was then looking
after the work -

6 On the 1st February 1902
Parthasarathi again presented
a petition to the Architect
praying

praying that the Promissory
be transferred to the name
of her brother-in-law
Kumaraswamie Dakshit
as had been already requested.
of mortgagor. This petition
was referred to the Temple
Peshkar for report. He
in his report no 121 dated
2nd February 1902, stated
that there was no objection
to the Promissory being
transferred to the name
of Kumaraswamie Dakshit
as he was the Hereditary.
Puttamma gave a deposition
also before the Assistant
Temple Peshkar on the 6th
February 1902, that the
Agamik Promissory be
transferred to the name of

10

the said
V. Kumaraswami Dakshi-
-and the whole pay attached
to the Office viz Rs 14 per mensem
he also given him as he was
, her sole Varusdar and
protector; and that the
golden seal given by Govern-
-ment ~~for~~ to the holder of
the Agamik's Office, which
she had with her, had
been given over by her to the
said Kumaraswami Dakshi;
and that she had transferred
to him her sole right and
responsibility of the Office of
the Agamik.

7 Kumaraswami Dakshi
also gave a deposition before
the Amildar on the 12th
February 1902, that the
appointment was hereditary
one

one in his family, that the
Petitioner Puttaswamy had
no other Varnashram than
himself and that she
was under his protection
In his deposition he also
added that he and his
brother Papu Dikshit were
the joint Purohits
of an Archak's appointment
in the same temple and
that as the latter had
(deceased brother's)
since died, his name
joint-
be struck off the Purohit

8 In submitting all
these papers to the Dy Comr
the Amildar, Mr Sundara
Rajiengar reported

Report-no 8 dated
8th February 1902

E

(i) that as the Archakar
the Pujari Agamik's Purohit
was be

registered in the name of
the said Kumaraswami
Dakshit,
(ii) that he would report
in due course, after the transfer of the
Property as above, whether
Kumaraswami Dakshit
would employ a separate
Competent man to do duty
as Ijaredar or whether
he would continue the
same Ijaredar Viz, one
Hullahalli Kumara Dakshit -
who had been temporarily
doing duty in the interval
iii that he had got back
the golden seal attached
to the Agamik's office from
the said Kumaraswami
Dakshit who had it with
him

him, and given it to the
possession of the person
who had been actually
temporarily
doing duty viz Hullakulli
Komara Deekshit

iv Held- in the matter of
Komaraswami Deekshit's
request to have his deceased
brother's name struck
off the joint Board
of the Archaks appointed
he would act as per order

v Held- the petitioner
deceased
Subbamma's brother
Aswatha Narayana Deekshit
had himself the Archak's
Board of the Amma-
-navara Lunidhi and
other minor temples
carrying a salary of
Rs

Rs 9 per measure and Hul-
none of the Varasdars of
the deceased have yet-
come forward claiming
this Office
and vi a Jamin Muteluliku
~~from the Agamik Karnamdar~~
after the change of the Barnward,
was necessary to be
obtained from him, as the Agamik Barnwardar; because
the most- Valuable jewels
were now and then being
given (from the Bokkasa)
on his (Agamik Barnwardar's)
responsibility. And On
a further query from the
Dy Commr on this report,
the ~~de~~ Amildar again reported * no 121 dated
that Kumaramami Dikshit
would make proper arrangemt- 16th May 1902
for the completion of the work H.
both at- Nanjangud and
at-

at Channarajnagar. He submitted Kumaraswami Dakshit's deposition also to that effect, as well as the deposition of Puttamma again taken from her on the 10th July 1902, to the effect that she had transferred her sole right to the land Kumaraswami Dakshit.

9 Before this was disposed of, Puttamma presented a petition to this Office, stating that her previous petitions regarding the transfer of the Barawad to Kumaraswami Dakshit had not been disposed of and praying that her request—

request should be complied
with. This petition having
been forwarded to the
Dy Commissioner for report,
Head Office sent it over
to the Amildar, who in *his Report no 39 dated
28th September 1902, stated
that as the petitioner
Guttamma had already
been getting Rs 4 for her
maintenance, she had no
work to the Agrarik's office
and that it did not seem
necessary to change his
Barnavad during her life-time
although Kamarusamani
Deekshit be considered
the Hakdar; that the
Barnavad might be trans-
ferred to him, in case
the

* The same per Sundara Rajamgar by.

Office note:—
This seems to be inconsistent with his previous reports.

he would do the work
personally and beat the work
however, if he should be
allowed to go to Bangalore
every year and then for
duty here, appointing a substi-
-tute for duty at Chamara-
-rajnagar, the Government
might be transferred to
this name, on condition
that he should appoint
as this substitute Huchu-
-chelli Nanjunda Rachaiah
who had been doing the
duty temporarily (during
this interval i.e after
the death of the previous
substitute Nanjunda
Rachaiah)

D. (on Kichha) & Commissioner
in reply to this office Memo

Encl

*: and Nanjunda Rachaiah
Rachaiah of Nanjunpur

states × what has been already noted in the latter part of the para 3 of this note.

× In his letter no 71 dated 18th October 1902

11. A fresh petition ✻ has been since received in this Office from Kuttanad, in which she states

(i) that Kumaraswami Dikshit of Manjampad is her sole Hakdar and protector

(ii) that the Agamik's appointment is being enjoyed by her family in hereditary succession

(iii) that her deceased husband had, during the minority of the said Kumaraswami Dikshit, been looking after the work both at Manjampad & at Chamarajnagar

✻ no 866 dated 13th November 1902.

H.

In support of this statement she has produced a copy of the Sanad given to the Agamik by the P

of the Chamarajeswara-
swami Temple under
the authority of the
District Magistrate Office
(Vide no 22 dated
18th October 1889).

I.

X. In support of this
statement (iii), she
has produced original
grants of H. H. the late
Maharaja Krishnaraja
Wadiyar Bahadur III
dated 24th June 1853,
10th June 1861 and 4th
September 1865.

J, K & L.

Chamarajnagar

X. (iii) that it is manual
in her family to look after
the work in both the places.

(iv) that the said
Kumaraswami Dakshit
has even now been holding
the Archakship of the
Chamarajeswara Temple
and the Agamikship of
the temples at
Kowmoor and Tirumala
- Kudla in addition;
and that Gokarnesa
Dakshit, the Agamik
of the Chamundeswari
Ammanavaru Temple
at Mysore,
has been similarly
holding the Archak's
and the Agamik's appoint-
ments also at the
Prasanna Ramaswamy

Swami Temple at Nagore
and at Tulkad,
manufacture of mangoes
in the T. Narasipur Taluk;
and Kul- Varuna
Subba Dikshit- Sivilar,
holds appointments in
the temples at Vaidyanathapura (Mandya Taluk)
and at
Varuna, Elangambadi
and Lakshmipura (in
the Nagar Taluk) as well
as in the Trinesvara-
Swami and the Prasanna
Ranganathaswami
temples at Nagore;
(V) Kul- in the Prasanna
Krishnaswami temple at-
Nagore and in the Thirumala
Swami Temple at Melkote
There are persons whose livelihood Bare
of appointments in the temple are
in their name. Kul although

In support of this statement, she has produced the following documents :-

(1) Temple Sarkaryagiri's Yadi no 11 dated 24th July 1889 to the Agamik Ramjumdar Dakshit (father's husband)

(2) Amildar's Hukum no 83 dated 16th October 1885

(3) Copies of the Correspondence ending with

although they are otherwise employed elsewhere in Government service or practising as High Court Vakeels &c ; and this has been the usual practice in the Magrai Department

(vi) that the Agamik's appointment in the Chamarajeswaraswami Temple is a very responsible one, the holder of which being specially allowed a Golden Seal by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar III, Bahadur being also invested with power of granting leave and of appointing the

appointment of Archaks, Paricharaks and Sthanikas in the temple and ~~Karnam~~ also ~~Karnamgrishtham~~ being solely responsible for the jewels &c in the temple (~~Appointments~~

2. Hullahulli Kumara Deekshit, who has been now doing duty as Gumasta temporarily on behalf of Puttamma, ~~Priya Karnam~~ the Paramount be not changed to the ~~S~~ name of Ranjumpad Kumaraswami Deekshit, as he has been already employed in several places.

13. Kumaraswami Deekshit of Ranjumpad has also presented a petition to this Office (dated

with the Amildar's Anji no 43 dated 2nd July 1856 between the Amildar and the Nagpur Commr

(4) Amildar's Yadi no 232 dated December 1864 and some other subsequent Yadis

* In this petn no 864 dated 15th November 1902 to this Office

dated 13th November 1902)

that the Agamik's appointment is a hereditary one in his family and that he is the only Hereditor to the Trust Office, having the sole various- -duties to perform (who has no children) and that he holds an Archak's appointment- also in the Chennarajeswara temple. He prays that the Archak's and the Agamik's appointments may be both amalgamated together and he be made the to both the Offices Superintendent, as requested by Puttamma. One Gargeswami Konanna Dikshitha is reported to have been doing the

Archak's duty in the
Chamundeswara Temple
as Gunasta on behalf
of the Bramarambadevi
Sanjeevini Komaraswamii
Devasthan

Submitted
ks
26/11/02

Deputy Secretary's remarks:—

14. Although some
extraneous matters
are to some extent
mixed up in this
correspondence still
the main subject
requiring orders
is the question of
the succession to the
Agamik's place in

the Chamarajeswara
temple at Chamaraj
nagar the appoint
ment is clearly one
vesting in the
family of the
present claimant,
Nanjangud Komara
Swamy Deekshitar.
The members of this
family have been
enjoying Agamiks
and Archak's places
in Chamarajnagar,
Nanjangud, Tiruma
-kudlu Narsipur
and Konanur, and
sometimes one man
has been holding

more than one
appointment. Nanjunda
Deekshita, one of the
members held the
Agamik's place
in Chamarajnagar
and after his
death the Baraward
of that appointment
was made in the
name of his widow
her own brother acting as Gumastha. Since the other
having died, the
widow Barawarddar
wishes to transfer
her Baraward to
the name of her
brother-in-law
Kumaraswamy
Deekshit (the brother
of the former
Barawardidar

Naijunda Deekshit),
who is admitted, on all
hands to be the
next Hakdar after
her.

15. The Amildar
temporarily appointed
one Hullahalli
Komara Deekshit
as the Gumastha
of the widow
Barawarddar, but
the latter would not
have him as she,
as Barawarddar,
was responsible
for the safety of
certain temple jewels,
and as she had
no confidence in
him. The Amildar

in his last report
stated that it
was unnecessary
to make any change
in the Baraward
so long as the widow
Baraward dar was
alive, and that,
if such a change
was considered necessary, then
it should be on
the condition that
his nominee Hullahalli
Konara Deekshit
should be the
working Gumastha
The Deputy Comr
says that as
Konaraswami
Deekshita holds
the Agamiks appoint
ment in Nanjangud

also, it is undesirable to change the Barawardi in his favour, as he cannot satisfactorily perform the duties in both the places.

16. The appointment in question is not only a hereditary appointment, but involves the responsibility of the safety of the temple jewels in every day use. On account of the latter the Barawarddar always gives security. Any gunnastha therefore has to be appointed

by the Barawarddar,
subject to the approval
of Government,
so that, ~~he~~ the Baraward-dar may
be held responsible
for the Gumastas'
acts. The Amildars
proposal that a
stranger should
act as the Gumastha
of the widow
Barawarddar
without her consent
cannot be supported
by Government,
who look to the
Barawarddar
for the safety of
the jewels. In the
present case, Kumara
-swamii Deekshit

is himself the Haldar to the appointment The widow has more than once expressed her wish to transfer the Baraward to his name and there seems to be no objection to the Change of Baraward prayed for. He must of course give the needful security for the appointment and appoint a suitable man as his Gumastha on the pay and emolu=ments as prescribed in the case of the Pattidar viz, Rs 7/- a month and 6 Bighas of Land

Papers & orders may be passed accordingly-

30.V.03

Draft

2/6/03

Draft submitted

2/6/03

a day. Such nomi-
nations should
also be approved
by the Deputy Board
17. As regards the
objection that the
man will be holding
more than one appoint-
ment in different
places, there seems
to be no help for
it, as the appointment
is hereditary in
his family, and
as he appears to
be the only surviving
member thereof.
As a matter of
fact he already
holds Agamik's &
Archaks appoint-
ments in Nanjanud.

Chamarajpet town,
T. Narasipur and
Konanur.

18. It may be added ~~that~~ a report has recently been received from ~~the Deputy Commr.~~ to the effect that Hullahalli Komara Deekshit, ~~the~~ Amildar's nominee has since died.

Orty 10494
26.5.03.

Submitted to the Hon'ble
25/5/03

The Revenue orders are recorded
on page 31 of this Note — M
2/6/03

P T O .

"Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note continued :—

Sri Krishnamurthi orders recorded on page 31 of this note were issued in Govt. Pro. No 1428 dt 2nd June 1903, sanctioning the transfer of the Baramahal to the name of Agamik Kumaraswami Deekshit and directing him to give the needful security for the appointment, entertaining a suitable Gumastha for the post

Sub D

The D. Comm. reported that the Agamik felt it derogatory to give security the nominal amount of which was nothing compared with the valuable jewels entrusted to him & no security was taken in the case of others and as it was not also in practice for a long time past to take security from the Agamik, the

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

Dy Comm^r solicited orders in the matter
Thereupon, M^r M. Shama Rao who E.
was then the Off^g Muzrai Secretary
ordered that as the Agamik himself
was not attending to the Duties
but had appointed a Gumasta
for it, it was desirable to obtain
Security in case of any misbehaviour
on the part of the Gumaster.

With reference to this, the Dy Comm^r
reports that the Agamik states that 7
although it had been
the practice to affix the Seals of the
Taluk Amildar, the Sheristkar & the
Agamik to the Bokkasa, the Amildar
M^r M.S. Puttanna did not give the
Agamik any information when he
handed over charge of the Temple jewels
to the present Amildar & that when
the Dy Comm^r inspected the jewels the
Bokkasa was opened & resealed without the

seal of the Agamik required by manual & that there, is the Agamik's responsibility regarding the temple jewels ceased & that consequently the order directing him to furnish security may be withdrawn & the gold seal in his possession may be taken back by Govt.

Mr. Vaidyanathier Iyer states that as Kumaraswami Deekshit is also the Agamik of the Nanjangud temple where he stays permanently it is not possible for him always to go to Chamarajnagar & be present whenever the Bokkasa has to be opened & as he has furnished no security in the Nanjangud temple, the gold seal of the Chamarajnagar temple Bokkasa may be taken back from

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

him & Kept in the name Bokkasa
In case however the gold seal
granted by H.H. the late Maharaja
Sri Krishnaraj Wadeyar Bahadur III
& the ancestors of the Agamik, should
be in the Agamiks possession, then
he should furnish the Secretary
— Muzrai Commr solicits orders
of Govt in the matter

Submitted for orders
Mysore 21
Rs
22/6/06

Note contd:—

A petition received from the Agamik
dy 21st June 1906 on the subject, is also put up

Muzrai Secretary's remarks:—

The Agamik Komaraswami Dikshit
now in question holds the Agamikship of the
important Eswara temples at Nanjangud
Chamarajanagar and Tirumakoodlu. His family

seems to have been highly respected in olden times and a golden seal given to his ancestors by the Maharaja, is in his possession. Although his responsibility as to the safety of temple jewels along with others in office is acknowledged, he and his ancestors do not appear to have given any security on account of their responsibility. This fact was not known time when orders were passed in Pro: No. 2428 of 2nd June 1903, directing him to furnish security. Not to speak of the want of dignity involved in having to give security the Petitioner will find it absolutely impossible to give security equivalent to the lacs of rupees at which the jewels of the temples of Chamarajanagar and Nanjangud are estimated. It may therefore be directed in modification of the orders already passed that no security may be furnished by Kumaraswami Dikshit.

(40)

Komaraswami Dikshita's responsibility however, should remain in tact as heretofore The old custom of his seal being also placed on the Bokkasa of the Chamarajanagar temple, which seems to have been interrupted latterly, should be insisted upon in future, and he should be present either in person or by the Gumasta Officiating for him whenever the Bokkasa has to be opened and closed.

He should arrange to leave the golden seal with the Gumasta when he himself cannot be in Chamarajanagar.

If approved, orders will be issued accordingly

(24)

Submitted to the 2nd Committee. 8.7.1906

66/9.7.06 Approved

no security need be demanded the responsibility for the Bokkasa should still continue as before. The golden seal need not be taken back.

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

No 312 & 313.
Encl

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 1 & 3

dated 21st July 1902 received at the

Dewan's Office from Luttamma

Wife of Ranjinta Dikshitar

Ayanik in the Sri Chamarajeswaraswami Temple

at Chamarajanagar,

praying that the Proceedings

may be changed so that

which now stands in her name is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~, to the Dy Commr,

of her brother-in-law Mysore District for

Ramaiah Dikshitar favour of a full report

together with the records

if any.

By Order,

Bangalore,
28/8/1902

Muzrai Secretary

Encl

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 20.10.02
REG. No. 274
MUZRAI BRANCH

1902

Refers
BS
20/10/02

FROM M. Kantha Raj Urs Esquire BA
Offg: Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog

To L. Anantaswamy Rao Esqre BA
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Inspection Department

Dated 18th October 1902.

Despatched

Received

General No. 71
No.

Enclosure No. 1

Regarding the petition of one Puttamma praying that the Baramahal of the Office of "Agamika" in the Chamarajeswara Swamy temple in Chamarajanagar which now stands in her name may be changed to that of her brother-in-law Kumaraswamy Dikshitu.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District.
Dated Mysore, 18th October 1902.

From

M Kantha Raj Urs Esquire B. A
Officiating Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esquire B. A.
Deputy Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum no: 312 dated 28th August 1902 and its enclosure - a petition of one Puttamma praying that the Barawand of the office of "Agnika" in the Chamarajeswara Swamy temple in Chamarajanagar - which now stands in her name - may be changed to that of her brother-in-law Kumaraswamy Dikshith, I have the honor to report as follows: —

The "Agnika" of the temple was one Nanjundiya. He died in June 1894 On his death the late Muzrai Secretary

Secretary directed that a moiety of the pay attached to the office should be paid to the widow of the deceased, i.e. the petitioner Puttamma, for her maintenance, and the balance left, to her brother, Aswatha Narayana Dekshith, who was doing the duties of "Agamik"

The said Aswatha Narayana Dekshith having since died Puttamma was called upon to select a Gumastha to do the work. She failed to do so, and so the Amildar, with the approval of this office, appointed one Komari Dikshith to act as a Gumastha on Rs 7 which used to be paid to the late Gumastha.

Finding that a moiety of the pay was going to a stranger Puttamma petitioned that the Banawandy might be made in the name of her brother-in-law Kumara Swami Dekshith but as this Kumaraswami Dikshith

already employed as the Agamika of the Srikanteswaraswami temple in Nanjengode on a pay of Rs 20/-. It was deemed inadvisable to make any change in the Baramanda

The petitioner's brother-in-law Kumaraswami Dikshith says no doubt that he will manage the work in both the temples, but having regard to the distance between Nanjengode and Chamarajanagar, and the liberal pay attached to the office at both places, I am not in favor of one man being the "Agamika" in both places, which, to say the least of it, is an unsatisfactory arrangement.

The Vernacular correspondence bearing on the subject ending with the Chamarajanagar Amildar's Ethile No: 39 dated 28. 9. 1902 is herewith forwarded for perusal.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

for Offg: Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Mysore

Read:—

Petn. Regd. no. 103 of 21st July 1902 from Puttamma widow of Nanjunda Dikshit praying that the Baravare of Agamik in the Sri Chamarajeswaraswami temple at Chamarajnagar may be transferred to her brother-in-law Nanjunda Komaraswamy Dikshit.

And,

Letter no. 71 dated 18th October 1902 from the Dy. Commr., Mysore District reporting on the above.

——"—— Order

Order thereon :—

From the records received with the Dy Commrs letter read above it appears that one Nanjunda Dikshit held the place of Agamik in the Sri Chamarajeswara Swami temple at Chamarajnagar and that after his death the Baravand of that appointment was made in the name of his widow her own

No 2428
Mun. F. No. 67-92 Enq/file

and

2429
Mun. F No. 67-92

Dy 2. 6. '03.

Viswatha Narayana Dikshita
brother desires a
Gumasta. That brother
having died, the widow
Baravardar wishes
to transfer her Baravard
to the name of her brother
-in-law Nanjanegud
Komaraswami Dikshit
~~(the brother of the former~~
~~Baravardar Nanjunda~~
~~Dikshit)~~ who is admitted
on all hands to be the
next Hakdar after
her. The Dy Commr.
reports that as Nanjanegud
Komaraswami Dikshit

holds the Agamiks'
appointment in
Nanjangud also, it is
undesirable to change
the Bavavard in his favor,
as he cannot satisfactorily
perform the duties
in both the places.

2. With reference
to the above the Govt.
observe that the
appointment in question
is not only a hereditary
one, but involves
also the responsibility
of the safety of the
temple

temple jewels in
every day use. Nanjangud
Komaraswamy Dikshit
is himself the Hakdar
to the appointment
The widow has more than
once expressed her wish
to transfer the Baramahal
to his name and Govt
see no objection to the
Change of Baramahal
prayed for. ~~He must~~ This Komaraswamy Dikshita
must of course, give the
needful security for the
appointment and

direct that the Agamik's
Baramahal now standing
in the name of the late
Guttamma, be changed
to that of Nanjangud
Komaraswamy Dikshita with
effect from the 1st June 1903.